

reviewed by the Privy Council. The decision of the latter body will finally and authoritatively settle the question.

It is certain that this settlement of the jurisdiction question will not be attained before the close of the next session of the legislature, which session will begin next month. The expression of public opinion has, however, been so strong that the legislature cannot afford to ignore it. Prohibitionists are anxious for immediate progress. They are and will be impatient of anything that seems like delay. There is, therefore, a great deal of anxiety as to what position our legislators will take and what action they will propose.

A number of temperance workers argue that the opinion of the leader of the opposition in the legislature is absolutely correct, and that the House's authority to prohibit liquor selling is not to any extent doubtful. They declare the opinion that the reference to the Courts is an expedient to retard settlement of the prohibition question, and demand the immediate enactment of a law similar to the measure which the House declined to pass last session.

On the other hand other earnest prohibitionists oppose this action. They claim that the vote of the people was given with an understanding that there should be a settlement of the question of jurisdiction before the enactment of legislation. This claim is based upon the fact that the Plebiscite Act and the Instructions to Voters, contained the following statement:—

Electors in voting "yes" on this question will be considered as expressing an opinion in favor of prohibition to the extent to which the Legislature of this Province or the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction, as may be determined by the court of final resort.

They express a fear that legislation respecting which any uncertainty existed, would be therefore ineffective, that its enforcement would be hampered by litigation, and that the difficulties connected with such a condition of affair<sup>s</sup> would be harmful to the prohibition cause.